THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

The Quarterly Gazette of the Anglican Society.

WINTER, 1944. **[WARTIME EDITION. 6d.]** **Vol. 15. No. 56**

President: The Revd. H. ADEANE BYARD, The Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.
General Secretary & Hon. Treasurer: The Revd. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.
Editor: The Revd. A. W. BLANCHETT, Chadlington, Oxford.
Diocesan Organizing Secretaries: List obtainable from the Hon. Secretary.
America: The Revd. F. F. E. BLAKE, 1625 Locust Street, Philadelphia.

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY ARE: 1.—To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer. 2.—To uphold and appreciate the English use, both in rite and ceremonial.

All who are in sympathy with the Objects of the Society are invited to communicate with the General Secretary. Annual subscription for members, 3/6, which includes subscription to the *English Catholic* (2/- per annum, post free).

GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES.

A letter recently received from the Revd. J. B. Goodchild, Honorary Organising Secretary for the diocese of Rochester, prompts me to write this note. He says:

"I have just left a fellow-member of the Anglican Society, and we have decided that we ought to have diocesan meetings as and when convenient. He tells me of one member who left the Society because it 'did nothing'. The purpose of our meetings will be to help each other in putting English traditions into practice by common study and discussion, and by acting as deacon and subdeacon at other members' churches on such occasions as the patronal festival. We shall probably receive fresh enthusiasm from the stimulus that we can give to each other, while our servers, choirs and organists may possibly benefit at the same time.

Could the *English Catholic* be used to put these ideas before our members? If so, I would suggest that the names of all Diocesan Secretaries should still be printed, and that all members of the Society should make it their business to get into touch with their local secretary, with a view to meetings for common study and discussion."

May I commend this suggestion to all members? Local meetings of this nature would prove particularly valuable in these days when it is so difficult to gather members together for a General Meeting. Even if only two or three members were able to come together at a time, they might well invite a few friends from neighbouring parishes, and so stimulate interest in quarters where the Society's work is as yet unknown. I am always ready to lend a copy of the List of Members to anyone who is trying to arrange a meeting in his neighbourhood, and to send literature for distribution, though I fear that for the time being until Paper Control regulations are relaxed, there will be no spare copies of the *English Catholic* available. Appended is a list of Diocesan Secretaries, though we cannot guarantee to print it in every issue. Volunteers for those dioceses unrepresented will be very welcome.

BATH AND WELLS—The Revd. H. J. Thomas, c/o Holy Trinity Vicarage, Hendford, Yeovil.
CARLISLE.—The Revd. K. F. Morris, Ennerdale Vicarage, Cleator, Cumberland.
CHICHESTER.—The Revd. G. Henniker-Gotley, Wivelsfield Vicarage, Hayward's Heath, Sussex.
DERBY.—The Revd. R. F. Borough, Bradburne Vicarage, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.
ST. EDMUNDSBURY AND IPSWICH.—The Revd. G. H. Harris, Uggeshall Rectory, Beccles, Suffolk.
GUILDFORD.—The Revd. G. O. Apthorp, Braidley, Wrecclesham, Farnham, Surrey.
LICHFIELD.—The Revd. W. C. A. Povey, 12 Hugo Street, Leek, Staffs.
LONDON.—The Revd. C. E. Pocknee, The Parsonage, 49 Wimborne Avenue, Hayes, Middlesex.
NORWICH.—The Revd. H. A. King, Holt Rectory, Norfolk.
OXFORD.—The Revd. J. E. Bowles, 11 St. Peter's Hill, Caversham, Reading.
ROCHESTER.—The Revd. J. B. Goodchild, Bridge House, Aylesford, Kent.
WAKEFIELD.—The Revd. W. E. Norris, St. John's Vicarage, Huddersfield.

A small, but interesting and helpful meeting on the above lines was arranged by our energetic Secretary for the diocese of London, the Revd. C. E. Pocknee. By kind

permission of Dr. Jocelyn Perkins, who also entertained the members to tea afterwards, it took place at 5 Little Cloisters, Westminster Abbey, on October 19th. The Revd. Leonard Spiller opened a discussion on the problem of patronage from the point of view of an incumbent of the English tradition who finds his work undone by the appointment of a Romanizer to succeed him. It was felt that there was an insufficient appreciation, particularly in episcopal circles, of the difference between a Catholic who is loyal to the Prayer Book and one who is not, but the enlightening of the episcopal mind on the subject was a delicate matter, to be done by personal and private contact rather than, as had been suggested, by deputation. After the meeting Dr. Perkins conducted members over the Abbey and showed them recent enrichments, including the admirable nave altar, and leaves of the richly illuminated book of benefactors, the text of which has been prepared by Dr. Perkins himself. A most enjoyable afternoon came to a close in friendly conversation over a cup of tea.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC SACRAMENT

IV. The Reformers versus the Mediævalists.

The Reformers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries protested against the crude idea of Christ slain afresh or immolated upon the altars of the Church. In this protest they were justified. They rightly insisted that Christ was slain once and for all upon the Cross. There was a completeness in the work of our Lord's Death and Passion, so that there could be no more slaying of sacrificial victims. The marks of that protest stand to this day in the central Prayer of the English Liturgy. "Who made there by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." No ancient liturgy has any statement of this nature. In this protest the English Reformers were at one with the reforming movements on the Continent. But the reformers as well as the mediaevalists supposed that sacrifice=death ; and they denied therefore that there was *any* sacrifice in the Eucharist.

The study known as "Comparative Religion" has in recent years thrown new illumination on the whole idea of sacrifice ; and we may say that death is only incidental to the sacrificial action. The killing of the victim does not in itself constitute "sacrifice." In the first part of this essay we set out the six parts or actions that constitute the full technique of sacrifice.

While the Reformers on the one hand protested against any fresh immolation of our Lord in the Eucharist ; on the other side the Counter-Reformation in the Latin Communion sought to explain and bolster up the mediaeval view of the Eucharistic sacrifice. It is of course in the Council of Trent that the "western" and mediaeval theory is exposed. It is only fair to add that many of the Jesuits, who were exponents of the statements of Trent, attempted to give a "mystical" meaning or interpretation to the immolation of Christ in the mass. The crucial weakness of the Tridentine theory of the sacrifice of the mass is, the absence of any reference to the eternal offering and priesthood of Christ in the Heavenlies.

The Liturgical Movement of the present day within the Roman Church has recovered in some sense the thought of the Ascended Christ. We quote from the late Abbot Vonier's address at the Louvain Liturgical Conference of 1937 :—

"What is the relation of the Mystery of the Eucharist to that of Christ's Glorification ? It may be expressed in two words : the Holy Eucharist is for the Christian the means of being unceasingly united to Christ in glory . . . When modern piety speaks of Christ's humiliations in the Eucharistic Mystery, its expressions and imagery can only be taken in a very limited and narrow sense . . . The Eucharist itself contains the glorified Christ, who is infinitely above all suffering . . . If we wish to consider the Eucharist more directly as a sacrifice, we shall find the same directing force under the aspect of Eucharistic immolation ; the sacrifice of the altar leads to Christ in Heaven. At the altar, Christians wash their garments and make them white in the Blood of the Lamb. That gives them the right to stand before God and to serve day and night in His Sanctuary . . . It is, then, of the very essence of the Eucharistic sacrifice to end in Heaven ; not in a Christ still being sacrificed, but in a Christ supremely triumphant, a consummation of all sacrifice." (*Buckfast Abbey Chronicle, Summer*, 1938.) [To be continued.]

WORSHIP AND THE ARTS.

(*From a Correspondent*).

The school-conference held at Pleshey last year, and recently described in *The English Catholic*, has renewed its experiment and extended its scope. Again in the lovely setting of the Chelmsford Diocesan Retreat House, hearers and doers, clerical and lay, listened, discussed, learnt, practised, and produced the services of the Church; and for many the rich simplicity of the daily services in the quiet white chapel must have opened a new door. Perhaps the radiant quality of services whose musical pivot is not the organ, but the human voice, was something of a revelation. The organ was not once touched; but there was richness on the one hand, and austerity on the other, in refreshing contrast. For all the music Dr. Martin Shaw was responsible, who not only practised the singers, but spoke with light, energy and humour, on "Hymns good and bad"; and he contrived an admirable recital of simple church music in the chapel. How completely Dr. Shaw inspired the music with "that afflatus or élan without which mere correctness will never get to the heart"!

At the previous conference it had become evident that though nothing but profit might be derived from consideration of all the arts ancillary to worship, the art of Liturgy was the keystone which must hold all together. Only with a sense of unreality could it be omitted. So, at the second conference, in addition to the stimulating papers of Mr. E. L. Watkin on "Catholic Art and Culture", of Mr. Dykes Bower on "The Church and Planning", of Mr. Geoffrey Holme (the Editor of *The Studio*) on "Visual Arts in Worship", of Mr. Alec Hunter on "Textiles", and an admirable dramatic production on the simplest lines by Miss Phyllis Potter of "The Tree" in Little Waltham church, the subject of Liturgy and Ceremonial was boldly grasped by the Dean of Chichester. It would be attractive to give an account of each paper, but for readers of this journal the outstanding importance of the Dean's observations, illuminated by lively reminiscences, must claim sole attention.

In considering current liturgical practice under the general title "Decently and in Order", the Dean of Chichester noted that enthusiasm and self-will are often mistaken for each other. After a brief examination of the nature of Religion as a whole, and of public worship in particular (which, he pointed out was an act of obedience of the created to the creator rather than an act of self expression), he swiftly outlined the growth of liturgical prayer—the external act of *prayer in the congregation* which was the right of every Christian, the regulation of the common prayer by the Bishop from the first century onward, and the universality of fixed rules by the 5th century; then the recent revival of "free prayer" in the Church of England because people get irked by what is customary, and the willingness of the clergy to see what they can do in this way. "But it requires a competence to do it which the majority have not, however admirable the motive." He instanced the rambling spontaneous biddings which are sometimes heard at the Holy Eucharist. On the other hand the early formulas are marked by the note of sobriety.

Prayer should never be clever, but should be based on the Scriptures, not on personal ingenuity. We need to deepen the conception of God and his works, remembering that the essence of prayer is the glorification of God: it is primarily praise and thanksgiving to God.

Christian worship is essentially *common* prayer, and it is difficult to sustain—on account of original sin. It is communal, and it is a New Testament conception that everyone should have a share. So far as the Choir Offices were concerned, the Dean thought we needed to revive the old co-operative character, reflecting the ancient scheme in which some 40 or 50 people were needed to carry out duties (precenting this or that) in singing Mattins. For the Psalms now, why not divide the congregation into two sections? Why not assign the lessons to different people? Why not let "the Clerks" sing the Litany, with the Priest intervening only at the Collects, where the Prayer-book says "Priest"?

But the dramatic action is "the Liturgy" itself. Let us start by recognizing that the norm of Christian worship is the Solemn Eucharist sung by the Bishop. In the absence of the Bishop, what is the essence of "solemnity"? It is, of course, the three sacred ministers, and it is contradictariness for one priest to sing the Eucharist while one or two others sink themselves into the

choir stalls. "Low Mass" is a makeshift, and tends to degradation—"the low-water mark of the eucharistic service," as Dr. Frere had put it.

In musing on his recollections of the great Benedictine Abbey of Marialach, the Dean spoke of being shown, with some pride, a magnificently printed missal. As he turned the pages, he pointed to the Canon and its directions for the Elevation: "That only came in in the thirteenth century", was the monk's reply. "The original Elevation is at the end of the Canon."

"Obedience is essential to corporate worship", claimed the Dean. "It is part of the beauty of worship: the duty which we pay to him who said 'To obey is better than sacrifice'." In the matter of performing the rite, some ceremonial is purely utilitarian, some largely regulated by custom. The earlier the custom, the more likely it is to be reliable as a guide. But the basis of authority is the Use of the Province. Before the Council of Trent there was no uniformity, but the passionate desire in the 16th century to achieve uniformity had produced the Missal of 1568 and the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

Speaking of St. Peter's, Rome, the Dean paused to remember the Canon Sacristan's pointing out to him that every altar had its frontal. Moreover, there was no bell rung in St. Peter's at the Elevation. Further, there had been no bell in any of the Papal Basilicas until Pius X. Even now, only a *very* small bell is rung; "and", added the sacristan, "nobody knows it!"

The Church of England preserved in the ancient Provincial Convocations the centre of authority, and that authority had been exercised conspicuously in the publication and use of the 1928 Book. But now we were passing through a phase of denigration and defeatism. "Perhaps the war has come to deliver us from this transvaluation of values."

Outlining principles to be practised if we were seeking obedience, truth, and beauty in worship, the Dean claimed that Reason and Tradition must be the two tests. "Tradition incarnates authority, and reason is necessary for the peace of the family. On the other hand there is a force at work", he said, "dragging us back to the realm of mumbo-jumbo."

There are many things in our ordering of worship, over which we do well to ask ourselves "Why?" Why do we read the Epistle and Gospel *away* from the people instead of *to* them? Why do we encourage kneeling during the Epistle? Why, in a rite which provides a perfectly suitable confession, do we use a separate confession before the service? (There is a tendency to extravagance, by additions and eliminations.) Why do we make people kneel so much? Why do we stand for the *Gloria* if the Eucharist is sung, but kneel if it is said?

"Let us avoid extragavance on the one hand", he concluded, "and parsimony on the other. In music as in ceremony, proportion is the essence of reasonable worship, and of beauty."

THE ENIGMA OF DARWELL STONE.

The important and fascinating life of Darwell Stone by Dr. F. L. Cross [Dacre Press, 30/-. [should be read by everyone who wishes to understand the recent history of the English Church. It is not my intention to review it, but to raise a question of some mportance which arises from it.

Darwell Stone was a man of immense learning, tremendous self-control, and great practical sagacity. He was for many years the acknowledged leader of the Anglo-Catholic Congress Party (which is, of course, far from including all Anglo-Catholics), and he did all he could, as party leaders must, to keep the party together, and to hold within it those who were more extreme than he was himself. He had very firm principles, from which he never swerved, and which were based on his vast knowledge of the Fathers. He was without any personal ambition: he hated publicity of any kind: he had the reputation of a saint, not altogether undeserved. Such a man was a tower of strength in English ecclesiastical politics. It is no wonder that his party would follow him anywhere, and that their opponents said that they "Bowed down to Wood and Stone". (Wood was E. G. Wood, the learned Vicar of St. Clement's, Cambridge).

Stone was no Papalist. He was well aware of the weakness of the case for the papal claims. He told the Rev. F. M. Downton that there were three ways of

defending the papal supremacy: the view that it came down from the Apostles, answered by Denny in "Papalism": the theory of Newman, which was unsatisfactory, did not justify the Roman position, and was not accepted at Rome; and the theory of Tyrrell, which made against all dogmatic Christianity, and which Rome had condemned.

He supported Gore in his dealing with the Caldey case (p. 112). He admitted, rather unwillingly, that "the direction in the Prayer-Book after the Communion of the people and the sixth post-Communion rubric taken together show that the Prayer-Book contemplates that the remaining portions of the Blessed Sacrament be not consumed until after the Blessing" (p. 280). He was no Fundamentalist (as most Anglican Papalists really are), for he accepted the Maccabean date of Daniel (p. 323). His independence of mind was shown by his desire to restore infant confirmation and communion (p. 73), which Western Christendom gave up centuries ago: and by his consent to the proposal that subdeacons should administer the chalice, for which there is no precedent at all (p. 160). It is not quite correct to call him "Tridentine": for he could not have accepted as necessary dogmas the statements of the Creed of Pius IV about the Papacy, and "he believed that Transubstantiation was not the only form of the doctrine of the Real Presence that could properly be termed Catholic" (p. 68). He did not hold the Roman doctrine that absolution without jurisdiction is invalid (p. 331), a very important point.

On the other hand he was undoubtedly the leader of the movement to introduce modern Romanist practice and even doctrine into the Church of England. He wrote that he could not easily express in language the strength of his desire to remove dissimilarities between the English Church and Rome. He habitually interpolated the Canon of the Roman Mass into the English Liturgy. He gave his ardent support to the cult of the Reserved Sacrament, though "he did not find that Exposition added anything to the worship of the Eucharist in the tabernacle with the doors closed": and "did not disguise his belief that a satisfactory theological basis for the practice was hard to discover." His theology was based on the Fathers, rather than on the Schoolmen: yet he defended many doctrines and practices which were supported by neither, such as the cult of the Sacred Heart.

In a divine so learned and so consistent as Stone this contradiction is difficult to explain; but it is important, because it is so widely spread among his followers. Romanism is a system founded on the Papacy. Stone (and many others) rejected the Papacy, but tried to assimilate the English Church to the system.

There were two men in Oxford, who were for many years closely associated with Stone: Bishop Gore and Father Puller. Puller was as learned as Stone: Gore was a greater (though less judicious) theologian. Neither of them agreed with Stone's attitude towards Romanism. For Puller the English Church was "in spite of disasters and menacing troubles, the most glorious church in Christendom." For Stone she was merely a way out of the difficulty that he could not accept the exclusive claims of either Rome or Constantinople (p. 297).

Stone had very remarkable limitations. He had never been a parish priest; for his only curacy ended before he was ordained priest. His experience of Romanism was confined to books and scholars: he had not had to meet the Roman proselytizer in the parish. If his ideal had been fulfilled, if all Anglican churches and services were hardly to be distinguished from Roman ones, the proselytizer's work would be much easier: many people have found it better to be a real Roman Catholic than a sham one. One of the strongest arguments against the cult of the Reserved Sacrament is that it is not desirable to accustom Anglican congregations to practices peculiar to Romanist worship.

Stone was Principal of a missionary college. He had never been a missionary; there is nothing to show that he took any special interest in missionary problems as such. He seems to have thought in terms of the Church of England (e.g. p. 241) rather than of the world-wide Anglican Communion. He set no great value on what was Anglican, because the word was associated for him with the strange doctrines of the Reformers (of which he had made a special study), and with the difficulties caused by the "Establishment," with which he was constantly confronted. He had no experience, as Gore and Puller had, of an Anglican church free to work out its own problems without State control.

He often spoke of "Rome and the East,"

but he seems to have known the Orthodox churches only from books and occasional visitors. He never visited any Orthodox country ; it is doubtful whether he was ever present at an Orthodox liturgy. This was still more true of the Finnish Lutherans whose agreement with the English Church he opposed. He was so firm in his own convictions, that he found it difficult to understand those of other people. Such men are rare among Anglican theologians, and all the more valuable, but they have limitations in negotiations for reunion! Stone's criticisms of the agreement with the Church of Finland were reasonable, but they were outweighed by other considerations, which he did not take into account, because he had had no personal contact with the Finns, and did not quite understand what was proposed.

It is not surprising that he led the opposition to the revision of the Prayer-Book, though the reasons which he gave were hardly worthy of him. One of the main objects of that revision was to stop the interpolation from the Roman Canon, for which it is difficult to see any possible defence, but which Stone had been doing all his life. To some of us the 1928 Prayer-Book brought freedom from the obsolete rubrics and the restricted choice of prayers to which the 1662 book had hitherto bound us. But Stone did not consider himself bound by those rubrics. To him the 1928 book brought not freedom but restraint : it forbade, as it was intended to forbid, the developments which he and his friends wished to promote.

The explanation of Stone's inconsistency appears to be that his doctrine of the Church was erroneous. Like many of his generation, he had become accustomed to the notion that the Church of England (he did not think in terms of the world-wide Anglican Communion) was part of a larger community called the " Western Church." If this were true, there might be some ground for holding that the rules of the smaller body must be interpreted by those of the larger body of which it would be a part. But it is contrary to historical fact. The English Church under Henry VIII might be regarded as an anomalous portion of Latin Christendom, though she had rejected the Papal Supremacy. But since 1559 the English Church has ceased to be a portion of Latin Christendom : she rejects not only the Papal Supremacy, but the Counter-Reformation with all its principles and methods. The proof of this is the doctrine, which all priests have to accept at their ordination, that nothing may be taught as dogma which cannot be proved by Scripture : which Anglican writers claim to have been the teaching of all the Fathers, but which is plainly a rejection of the fundamental position of Trent, that tradition ranks beside Scripture as a source of dogma. The Anglican Communion claims to present a third aspect of Catholicism, neither Eastern nor Latin : the whole course of Anglican theology from Hooker onwards is a proof of this. Stone appears to have regarded Anglicanism as " Western," that is Latin, but not Papal, and to have longed for the general adoption of methods of devotion characteristic of the Counter-Reformation. This explains why he was so much upset by the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, because it declared that ten practices were " subversive of the teaching of the Church of England " (p. 82). Not one of these practices has any basis in Scripture, or in Anglican formularies. Four or five of them have Orthodox sanction. But though the Mass of the Presanctified, for instance, is primitive and Eastern as well as Latin, that does not justify an Anglican priest in reviving it without permission in a church which dropped it centuries ago : to do so implies that the English Church had no right to drop it, which is subversive of the whole Anglican position. The remaining five are purely Latin. Yet the condemnation of them " involved a challenge to Stone's whole conception of the status of Ecclesia Anglicana in the Church Catholic ! " The Eucharist was his special study, and he was horrified at the suggestion that " the Church of England had repudiated the Eucharistic teaching which found expression at the Fourth Lateral Council." What he does not seem to have realized is that to regard such teaching and the practices founded on it as authoritative implies acceptance of the papal claims. It was the doctrinal authority of Rome, rather than the truth of Transubstantiation, that the Commission regarded as subversive. (It was a Royal Commission, from which exact theological language could not be expected : not a committee of divines.)

And here we find another curious point about Stone. In dealing with the Invocation of Saints, and with the Immaculate Conception and Assumption of the Blessed

Virgin, he was less interested in what is true than in what is tenable. He argued that nothing in Anglican formularies forbids us to hold these doctrines: he did not argue that they are true. The real question about Invocation of Saints is, whether we can be sure that the Saints can hear us: and neither Stone nor any one else has answered it. The reason why the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption should not be taught in Anglican churches is not that the English Church denies them, but that there is no evidence for them. Stone, perhaps because he had never been a parish priest, did not realize how easily an opinion which has been made the basis of devotion becomes a doctrine which no one dares deny. (I myself, when I was working in a "Western Use" parish, found the intellectual bondage as trying as the disregard of the rubrics. I might not, for instance, say in public that St. Mary Magdalene, our patron saint, was not, in my opinion, St. Mary of Bethany.) It is most important to distinguish between dogma and opinion: and to base our doctrines upon nothing which lacks the support of Scripture, Church authority (which for us is Anglican authority) and reason. Corruption of doctrine usually comes from popular devotion, based upon traditions the truth of which is doubtful. Transubstantiation and the Invocation of Saints are doubtless tenable by Anglican theologians (as opinions, not as dogmas); but to teach them to those incapable of making the theological distinctions required to guard them (which Stone was always careful to make), and to build upon them devotional practices without the authority of that part of the Church to which alone we are responsible, especially when we are under the perpetual pressure of Romanist proselytizing agencies, deserves the reprobation which the Commission gave it.

The Anglican Communion owes a great debt of gratitude to Stone for his learning, his firm adherence to principle, and the soundness of his judgment. Men of his type, completely unmoved by popular clamour or worldly ambition, are rare among leaders of the Church. It is all the more regrettable that his great services to the Church should have been spoilt by his adherence to a false theory of the place of the Anglican Communion in Christendom, and that he should have put himself at the head of a group which, in its eagerness for so fantastic an object as Romanism without the Pope, betrayed the cause of the Oxford Movement by supporting Parliament against Convocation and the Church Assembly, and by failing to distinguish what is Romanist from what is Catholic, has needlessly aroused suspicion, confused the public mind, and retarded the growth of that genuine Catholicism which alone can solve the problems both of the Church and of the world.

C. B. Moss.

OFFICE HYMNS.

The use of Office Hymns is fairly common, but it is doubtful if this use is generally put to advantage. The value of these hymns is the marking of a season or festival, and therefore giving to the service a point which, it is sometimes complained, is lacking owing to the absence of antiphons and invitatories in the Prayer-book. But the special value of these hymns surely is confined to their use at particular seasons and festivals. Is there really any advantage in using, for instance, *Lucis Creator optime*, at Evensong every week for half the year? Surely it is nothing but pedantry.

The same consideration applies to the position in the service at which the office hymn is used. Bishop Frere wrote many years ago in "The Elements of Plainsong" (P.S.M.M.S.): "An office hymn seems nowadays to be out of place in the position which it occupied at Evensong or Lauds, that is before *Magnificat* or *Benedictus*, for the structure of our Morning and Evening Service differs greatly from that of the Breviary offices from which they were developed; but this objection does not extend to the position of the hymns at Mattins in the Breviary, where it stands between the *Venite* and the Psalms, and gives to the whole service from its beginning onward the character appropriate to the season or festival. This position is still available, and is *far* the best place that can be reserved for the office hymn at our Mattins, and by analogy at Evensong. Liturgical precedent and practical considerations both point in the same direction, for an office hymn is recognised to be of far more practical value at the beginning of a service than when it is nearly over." "The evidence of Prime, Terce, Sext and None reinforces that of Mattins, and for the same position at Evensong there is the authority

of the Ambrosian Breviary." The very unliturgical custom of having a hymn before the beginning of the service points to a need which would be satisfied by Bishop Frere's proposal.

There is another consideration. In a good many churches, where the chief service on Sunday morning is the Choral Eucharist, Mattins is not sung, and the morning office hymns are seldom or never used. They could be very appropriately sung in the position of the Introit or the Gradual at the Eucharist.

E. G. P. WYATT.

THE BENEDICTUS QUI VENIT.

The origin of the Benedictus qui venit is obscure. It appears originally to have been an anthem, or popular people's acclamation, addressed either to the emperor—who would have come from the nave to his throne in the sanctuary as it was sung—or to the bishop who would have gone from his chair behind the altar to the altar with his college of presbyters for the Eucharistic Prayer proper. In the late mediaeval period the thought seems to have been transferred to the coming of our Lord in his sacramental presence. It probably had something to do with the elevation—probably the elevation just before the communion of the people—and even there the anthem would be a greeting to the communicants. Just when it got attached to the Sanctus is impossible to say in the East and non-Roman West. It is an interpolation and not a very good one. The Sanctus and Benedictus are two distinct liturgical forms. The Sanctus was probably introduced in the Roman Mass from the African Church about the year 150. The Benedictus was introduced from the Gallican Church, not before the eleventh century. The two forms have no literary or liturgical connection.

The fact that it is an interpolation is shown in all liturgies, Eastern and Western (except the Roman, which is unusual in that the prayer starts with intercessions, instead of thanksgiving) for the opening phrases of the Eucharistic prayer never mention it. They would do this if it were not an interpolation. They all carry out the thought expressed in the Sanctus—"Truly holy art thou . . . ," "With the blessed powers, ... we also cry aloud and say: Holy art thou . . . ," "Full is the heaven, full is the earth also of thy excellent glory . . ." The ancient liturgies all have a cue word for the beginning Eucharistic Prayer taken from the Sanctus. There is always the idea of holiness or of glory, and this cue never carries out a thought expressed in the Benedictus.

Our Prayer Books since 1549 have generally omitted the Benedictus—though one or two of the latest revisions allow it as an anthem. Rather we have the perfect expression from a scientific liturgical standpoint—the angelic hymn—then the Amen, the connective meaning Yea verily, of the cue word Glory.

It is worth more than passing notice that it is not sung in practice in the Roman Church to this day after the Sanctus when a priest celebrates, but the ancient connection with the elevation is kept up, and it is strictly forbidden by the Sacred Congregation of Rites to be sung before the elevation of the chalice. Another point worth noticing is this: when a bishop celebrates in the Roman Church it is sung after the Sanctus, and from a study of liturgical remnants, this would be a salutation to the bishop who at some remote period went from his throne to the altar after the Sanctus.

There is no reason that I can see for its interpolation into our liturgy. It destroys the connecting link between the Sanctus and the Prayer of Consecration. It introduces an incongruous thought. If it is sung at all, I suppose the best place would be just before the communion of the people as it is in the liturgy in the Apostolic Constitutions, and which appear to be one of the original places. This has been done in some of the Anglican revisions. It has meaning there, but when it is interpolated between the Sanctus and the Prayer of Consecration, it has no liturgical justification and little meaning. It is psychologically bad in that it drags our thoughts down from the contemplation of heavenly things to an acclamation that may mean our Lord, but probably means our miserable selves.

The Benedictus qui venit in the various Prayer books of the Anglican Communion:

1549—in, but in a slightly different form.
1552, 1558, 1662—out.
English 1928—permissive, but printed at end of service.
Scottish—permissive.
American—omitted.

South African—omitted.
Indian Liturgy—1933—just before communion.
"Holy things for holy persons"—Blessed is he that . . . [Prayer.
Ceylon 1939—after the Pax after the Lord's
Irish 1926—omitted.
Canadian 1921—omitted.

F.F.E.B.

(From the *News Sheet* of the American Branch—Sept. 1943).

THE ANGLICAN CONTRIBUTION TO REUNION AMONG THE "REFORMED" CHURCHES.

(Continued from the Autumn issue).

Loving the sacramental system as we do, we naturally have a special place in our hearts for that element of it which specially unites us with the historical life of Our Lord in Palestine and with the life of Christendom in the centuries between then and now. That is of course the purposeful contact which we call the Apostolic Succession, beginning with those who saw and handled the Word of life, coming in a continuous chain—or rather web of many interweaving strands—through the chief features of the Church right through the Christian era, and reaching the priesthood and diaconate in Holy Order and the laity in Confirmation. It is surely natural also that we should regard this as the outward sign of the authority and Spirit of Christ in His Church, as did the Apostles before us.

The canonical requisite of several bishops for the consecration of another not only ensures an unbroken succession, but also provides those interweaving strands of apostolic contact which bind the Church together, and which no doubt were largely responsible for the description of episcopacy as the "sacrament of unity" centuries before the Broken Bread was so described. (Admittedly the contemporary strands of unity would stop short at denominational barriers, though by tracing the continuity back beyond the various schisms it is possible to show a roundabout connection even between those episcopalian bodies which are definitely divided, as for instance between the Anglican and Roman communions).

Now we are here discussing the problems of reunion with just those bodies which have abandoned all claim to the Apostolic Succession.

The reasons for this loss are various. In some cases it may have been mere inadvertence, where the gift was not valued, but more often it has been surrendered to gain or preserve something which was regarded as more important; freedom from state control, freedom from dictatorial bishops, freedom from popular and well entrenched doctrines which the dissenters regarded as heretical, and so forth. The relative values of these things depend partly on circumstances and could be debated till the crack of doom without much likelihood of agreement, but the question is not particularly relevant to reunion. Presumably no honest dissenter will unite with Anglicans unless he is satisfied that the good things for which his community stands are reasonably assured. We hear that in South India they accept episcopacy; and they are entitled to see that it is an orthodox and constitutional episcopacy, free from state control. If they are not satisfied they are bound to refuse episcopacy altogether, but if they are satisfied and accept, surely the next move is to spread the Apostolic gift in its appropriate degrees among their clergy and people as widely and rapidly as is practicable. The fact that they say that Confirmation and Holy Order will not necessarily be required in the reunited church shows that they do not yet regard it as a gift at all. It is not that we have failed to persuade them to value the Gift as highly as we value it, but that they—and some of our representatives with them—do not concede it any value whatsoever. Can it be true charity to bring our most precious treasures into circles where they will barely arouse so much as a polite interest, or to hand them over to people who seem likely casually to mislay them without missing them? Would it not be more reasonable to try and explain their value first?

These examples of the suggested approach concern only two of what we may call the "catholic" contributions to a united Christendom; there are other contributions we have to make such as the liturgical tradition and the expression of the Faith in ancient creeds, well worn and matured and adapted to their use. But even when they have allowed for this limita-

tion of scope, readers may perhaps be shocked, not by what I have said, but by what I have left unsaid. Nevertheless I think this article as it stands would be too strong meat for the average nonconformist. If it is our duty to resist a reunion which has no real basis, it is equally our duty to strain every nerve to establish a real basis by explaining our aspect of the questions upon which we differ. If our explanations are to be useful they must begin at the beginning, and be related as closely as possible to those fundamentals upon which all Christians are agreed. If they are to begin at the beginning we must train our minds to be able to brush aside the corollaries of our more fundamental beliefs, so as to be able to examine these beliefs themselves, and express them in language that our hearers can understand. When this is done it is only necessary for us to pray sincerely for charity and humility to enable us to show the beauty of what we have seen of the truth, undarkened by the ugliness of our personal or communal character.

N. P. BRUCE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BASIC PRINCIPLES.

SIR,—The triennial General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, from October 2nd to October 11th. Of the many crucial issues to face this council, three have been singled out by common consent as most important.

The first of these is a pair of new Marriage Canons proposed by a very fine committee of the Convention which has been meeting frequently for the last three years. The work upon which the canons are based extends much further back than that. The proposed canons would make it possible for a divorced person to remarry in the Church one year after the divorce if he obtained the permission of his Bishop. The argument for the canon is that the Church must face the realities of modern life which include frequent divorces. The more telling argument against it is that it conflicts with both the teaching of Christ and the historic position of the Catholic Church.

The second highly controversial issue will be the question of a see for the Presiding Bishop. At present the Primate of the American Church is simply relieved of his diocesan duties; he has his jurisdiction in his own diocese even when the representative of the whole Church. Most commonly suggested is carving a diocese for him out of the Diocese of Washington, where he now has a seat in the National Cathedral. Although many groups oppose this move, it is certainly highly desirable for the head of the American Church to have a recognized see during his term as Presiding Bishop.

The third of these issues has received far more attention than both of the others together. It is called "Basic Principles." Basic Principles are a set of fundamental characteristics of a united Presbyterian-Episcopal Church, adopted by the official commissions of both churches dealing with the subject. Both churches have adopted resolutions pointing to organic unity: the problem is now to pass upon these Basic Principles as the fundamentals of the united Church.

Basic Principles have been much discussed in the Church press, and much prejudice has been aroused by the issue. It has re-opened every difference of opinion between Catholics and Protestants, and has started constant warfare between the two groups in the Church.

The basis for the program is the Lambeth Quadrilateral: reunion of Christendom on the basis of the Bible as the revealed Word; the Creeds as the Church's Faith; the two sacraments instituted by Christ; and the historic Episcopate. The Bible is accepted by both churches, but no standards for its interpretation are mentioned. The Creeds are accepted by both churches, but no standards for their interpretation are mentioned. Baptism shall be "by water and in the triune name," but this does not forbid the Presbyterian use of sprinkling with flowers, which is very common but repugnant to all Episcopalians. The Holy Communion shall include certain formulae, but there are no Presbyterians who would think these formulae made it anything but a simple memorial of the death of Christ. The Presbyterians feel they could still use grape-juice (unfermented wine); The Presbyterians will accept the Episcopate, but Presbyterian supporters of the Basic Principles say it will not be a separate order of the Ministry, but simply an office, like that of Moderator. And certainly the Presbyterian ministers have no feeling they will become Catholic priests as a result of the union. Confirmation can be either by a Bishop or a "duly authorized presbyter," which is what the Presbyterians hold the Bishop will be!

Certainly this short treatment cannot do justice to the hundreds of pages of print, and the thousands of tracts, which have been issued on both sides. Despite the great numbers of members of both churches which support the Basic Principles as the basis for reunion, the limitations are so great that few Catholics can countenance them.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and the English Church play a vital role in this issue, and their supposed stand on this issue is almost certain to be mentioned in General Convention debate. There are very few Episcopalians who would even consider this program, if they did not feel that the united Church would be welcomed into communion with the English Church. Correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury has been accepted by both those opposed and those in favor of the Principles to indicate his endorsement of the plans. But the Catholics in the American Church are still fighting for repudiation of these plans: what General Convention does remains to be seen.

Cambridge 38, *Mass.* T. G. JOHNSON.

Printed and published by
A. T. BROOME & SON, The Cherwell Press, 18 St. Clement's Street, Oxford.